DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CRC
REVIEWED BY _____ DATE _____
EDS ☐ OR XDS ☐ EXT. DATE _____
TS AUTH. _____ REASON(S) _____
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐
DECLASSIFIED ☐ RELEASABLE ☑
RELEASE DENIED ☐
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS _____

1709

INTRODUCTION

Representatives from the Peoples Temple first went to Guyana in 1973 to explore the possibility of establishing an agricultural settlement. In 1974, the Peoples Temple was granted a long-term lease on 27,000 acres in northwest Guyana. This region is primarily tropical rain forest bisected by rivers and is sparsely populated with little government infrastructure. The area is inaccessible by land from Georgetown, the capital of Guyana, and can only be reached by chartered plane or boat.

Between 1974 and 1976, the Peoples Temple cleared an area of about 300 acres and built housing and other structures. Agricultural projects were started with the goal of making the settlement self-supporting. Between early 1977 and 1978, the population of the settlement is said to have grown from 40 to about 1,000 people.

Relations between the Peoples Temple and the Government of Guyana, particularly with the Ministries of Economic and National Development, were good. The Peoples Temple decision to establish an agricultural

community in northwest Guyana paralleled the Guyanese Government's expressed goal to open the interior of Guyana for agricultural development. The Guyanese were impressed with the dedication and discipline displayed by the Peoples Temple in carving an agricultural settlement out of the jungle within a short period. Sometime in 1975, the Temple established a liaison group to operate in Georgetown to perform administrative and liaison tasks with the Government. While the Government of Guyana continued to endorse the Peoples Temple agricultural community up to the time of the visit of Congressman Leo J. Ryan, some Guyanese officials became increasingly concerned during 1977 and 1978 about the large number of Americans emigrating to Jonestown and the possibility that they might be engaging in illegal activities. They were unable to confirm these suspicions, however.

From 1974 when first settlers arrived in Jonestown until mid-1977, Embassy contacts with the Peoples Temple were of a routine consular nature. Only on one occasion did the Chief of Mission meet with the Rev. Jim Jones, head of the Peoples Temple. That was in December 1976, when Mervin Dymally, Lt. Governor of California, traveled

to Guyana and visited Jonestown. Dymally called on the Chief of Mission accompanied by Rev. Jones.

Embassy officials first became seriously concerned about Peoples Temple activities in Guyana in mid-1977 as a result of charges against the Peoples Temple which began appearing in the press in California. At about the same time the Embassy began receiving welfare and whereabouts queries from friends and relatives of residents of Jonestown. Some of these letters alleged serious mistreatment of named individuals. As a result of these specific queries and the general charges that had appeared in the press, the Embassy instituted a program of regular consular visits to Jonestown. In addition to performing routine consular services, Embassy officers interviewed privately every person who had been named as a victim of mistreatment of some kind. In no case did the individuals interviewed confirm the charges that had been made by their friends or relatives or take advantage of the Consul's offer to escort them from the community and repatriate them to the United States.

The Embassy became more closely involved with Peoples Temple issues as a result of the child custody case

concerning John Victor Stoen, the son of two former members of the Peoples Temple. A California court had awarded custody of the Stoen child to his mother, but he was residing in Jonestown with the Rev. Jones, who also claimed legal custody. Because both the disputants in this case, which aroused strong emotions on both sides, were American citizens, it was necessary for the Embassy to maintain an objective and neutral attitude. However, the Embassy did send the Government of Guyana a diplomatic note at one point asking that due process by accorded both the disputants in the case, and urging that it be adjudicated in a timely way. The Stoen case emerges from the record as being of central importance because both Rev. Jones and his followers on the one hand, and the organization of concerned relatives on the other, attached increasing symbolic significance to the custody of the child. In addition, it was partly the Stoen case which led Congressman Ryan to decide to make a personal visit to Guyana.

The Department briefed Congressman Ryan and his staff on four separate occasions between September 15, 1978 and November 14, the date of his departure for Guyana. The Embassy provided additional detailed briefings after his

arrival in Georgetown. There was no reason to expect violence as a result of Congressman Ryan's visit, but it was emphasized that he should secure the permission of the Peoples Temple before attempting to travel to Jonestown. He was told that the probable result should he not get advance clearance would be that the Peoples Temple would refuse him entry to Jonestown. He was also advised that the inclusion of newsmen and concerned relatives in his party could result in the Peoples Temple refusing him permission to visit Jonestown. The Embassy played an active role in securing an invitation for Congressman Ryan to visit Jonestown from the Peoples Temple, and the Deputy Chief of Mission accompanied the party.

ARA/CAR:ACHewitt/btk 12/1/76 x22621

Peoples Temple

Answers to Questions in Chairman Zablocki's letter of November 21 to Secretary Vance

1. QUESTION: To what extent were the Department of State and the American Embassy in Georgetown, Guyana, aware of the potential danger to the Ryan Delegation of a visit by them to Jonestown?

ANSWER: The Department and the Embassy at Georgetown briefed Congressman Ryan and his staff extensively before his trip to Jonestown in Northwest Guyana. He met with on Assistant Secretary Viron P. Vaky on September 15 accompanied by members of his staff. In addition to Ambassador Vaky, Department Officers at the meeting included Deputy Assistant Secretary Sally Shelton, the Director of the Office of Caribbean Affairs, and the Guyana Desk Officer. The Congressman reviewed his four-year investigation of the Peoples Temple and stated his intention of travelling to Guyana in November to visit Jonestown. He received an in-depth briefing from Department Officers on their knowledge of the Peoples Temple and its activities in Guyana. Following this meeting the Department informed

Embassy Georgetown of Congressman Ryan's plans and received its assessment of possible problems. Thereafter Department Officers, including political, consular, and legal officers met with members of Congressman Ryan's staff on October 3 (memorandum at Tab) and October 25 (memorandum at Tab) to discuss various aspects of the forthcoming visit. An additional meeting between Congressman Ryan, his staff, and members of the concerned relatives organization took place on November 13, the day before his departure for Guyana (memorandum at Tab). Congressman Ryan's staff and the Guyana Desk Officer were also in frequent contact. After the arrival of Congressman Ryan and his party in Guyana they were given extensive briefings by Ambassador Burke and his staff (Georgetown 3125, 9/25/78)

The Department of State and the American Embassy at Georgetown were not of the opinion that Congressman Ryan and his party would be in physical danger in a visit to the Peoples Temple community at Jonestown providing permission for the visit had been secured in advance from the Peoples Temple.

Jonestown had been visited by officers from the Embassy on at least five occasions during 1977-78 without incident (Georgetown 2087, 6065, 1544). In addition, there were a number of visits by various dignitaries, including Lieutenant Governor Dymally of California in December 1976. High officials of the Guyanese Government also visited Jonestown without incident during this same period.

Both the Department and the Embassy emphasized to Congressman Ryan and his staff the importance of securing advance agreement for the visit from the Peoples Temple, and indicated that failure to do so might result in permission to visit Jonestown being refused. It was clearly implied in the Embassy's briefings that any attempt to force entry to the community "could have unfortunate consequences of a legal and possibly even a violent nature" (Georgetown 3924 at Tab). Congressman Ryan finally obtained an invitation to visit Jonestown as a result of the interventrion of the Embassy, the Government of Guyana, and the Guyanese Ambassador to the United States, but the issue was in doubt up to the last moment.

The Department also said in its briefing of September 15 that the Reverend Jim Jones and the inhabitants of the Peoples Temple were likely to react negatively to the inclusion of media representatives in Congressman Ryan's group, and also to the presence of relatives or former Peoples Temple members. The Department advised against including former members of the Peoples Temple and relatives of Jonestown residents in the group. It was recommended that if relatives were to be included they be left in Georgetown, and that no attempt be made to gain entry to Jonestown for them.

Although neither the Department nor the Embassy had reason to expect violence from the members of the Peoples Temple providing prior agreement was obtained, the Congressman was warned about the rugged physical conditions in Northwest Guyana where Jonestown is located (Georgetown 3125 OP. CIT.), and it was made clear that a visit to Jonestown would be a difficult undertaking at best, and might be impossible depending on weather conditions and the availability of transportation.

2. QUESTION: What advice did the Department of State and the Embassy in Guyana give Congressman Ryan with respect to the potential violence which could arise as a result of such a visit in view of the presence of weapons in Jonestown and the mood of its inhabitants with respect to visits by outsiders?

ANSWER: As indicated above, neither the Department nor the Embassy had any reason to expect violence from the inhabitants of Jonestown. Congressman Ryan was advised of the likely sensitivity of the Peoples Temple to the inclusion of newsmen or relatives in the party, and of the rugged physical conditions he would encounter.

During the periodic visits of a Consular Officer to Jonestown, no weapons were observed nor had the presence of weapons, beyond a few guns used for hunting, been reported to the Embassy by Guyanese officials or other visitors to the community (Georgetown 3925 at Tab). The Department and Embassy were aware of allegations of armed guards at Jonestown (the Stoen letter and its attached petition at Tab , and the Blakey Affidavit at Tab). However they

had never been able to confirm these reports either by direct observation of their Officers visiting the community, or by reports of the visits of others including Guyanese Police Officers whose visits were frequently unannounced. As noted above, the mood of the inhabitants of Jonestown had been peaceful with respect to a number of visits by outsiders, official or unofficial, during previous years.

On one occasion in September, 1977, the residents of Jonestown had behaved in a manner described as hostile toward the attorney for the Stoen family accompanied by Guyanese Marshals, who attempted to serve papers on the Reverend Jim Jones (Georgetown 2206 at Tab). While the Jonestown residents resisted the serving of the papers and were unfriendly, they did not become violent or threatening.

3. QUESTION: Once Mr. Ryan made known his intent to visit Jonestown, did the American Embassy request the Government of Guyana to provide the delegation with security protection or other assistance? If not, why not, and if so, what was the nature and extent of the response on the part of the Government of Guyana?

ANSWER: The Embassy did not request the Government of Guyana to provide the delegation with security protection or other assistance, nor did the delegation raise the subject of security protection. It was

felt that as long as the delegation had the prior agreement of the Jonestown community to visit, there was no need for such protection in view of the fact that many other outsiders had previously visited the community without incident.

The Government was informed of the delegation's visit well in advance of the Congressman's arrival and the Foreign Minister of Guyana received Congressman Ryan for an hour-long meeting the day after his arrival in Georgetown. In his meeting with the Foreign Minister, Congressman Ryan made brief mention of the purpose of his visit, but made no request for protection, and neither did the Foreign Minister suggest it. In fact, Congressman Ryan spent most of the hour with the Foreign Minister discussing bilateral and international issues (Georgetown 3125 OP. CIT.).

The Government of Guyana did send along with the delegation on its visit to Jonestown an official from its Ministry of Information who was with the Congressman during his entire time in the Jonestown community. This officer accompanied the delegation into Jonestown, spent the night there, and left

with the delegation for the airstrip the following day.

Another guarantee of security seemed to be the presence of two American lawyers who were legal representatives of the Reverend Jones and the Peoples Temple and who traveled to Jonestown with the party. In fact, these two attorneys went into Jonestown in company with Congressman Ryan in order to negotiate the terms of entry for the press and "concerned relatives" group accompanying them to Port Kaituma. The two attorneys, who had visited Jonestown often in the past, were present at Jonestown for the entire period of the delegation's visit.

4. QUESTION: What communication facilities were available to the Ryan delegation during the member's stay in Georgetown and Port Kaituma? What special arrangement for communications with Jonestown, if any, were made for the Ryan delegation?

ANSWER: While Congressman Ryan's delegation was in Georgetown Embassy communications facilities were fully available to him. It was explained by the Embassy that communications between Georgetown and Jonestown were primitive at best, and consisted of an amateur radio link between the community and

its Georgetown office, both terminals of which were, of course, under Peoples Temple control.

No special communications arrangements were made for the Ryan Delegation nor were they requested by the delegation. However, on the afternoon of Friday, November 17, the Consul went to the Georgetown office of the Peoples Temple and used their shortwave facilities to confirm that the Congressman and his party had been admitted to Jonestown and that things were going well. It will be remembered that there had been some doubt up to the last moment that the Congressman would be admitted to Jonestown as a result of the presence of newsmen and concerned relatives in his party. The The Embassy was informed through this channel that due to its late arrival at Port Kaituma the delegation had accepted an invitation to stay overnight at Jonestown. During these transmissions over the shortwave link, our Consul spoke directly with Deputy Chief of Mission Dwyer who was accompanying the delegation.

5. QUESTION: How many visits to Jonestown has the American Embassy made on behalf of citizens' inquiries since the inception of the settlement? What were the specific findings and results of these visits? Did the Embassy representatives have full and complete access to the inhabitants and facilities in Jonestown?

ANSWER: Officers of the American Embassy and the Department made a total of six visits to Jonestown since its inception in 1973. Five of these visits were made over the past sixteen months. A visit scheduled for August 1978 had to be aborted because heavy rains had rendered the airstrip at Port Kaituma unusable (Georgetown 2510). The visits served several purposes including maintaining communication with this community of American citizens, providing consular services to the inhabitants of Jonestown, and pursuing welfare and whereabouts inquires from friends and relatives of the members of the Peoples Temple Jonestown. During each visit the Consular Officer toured the site extensively and was free to observe the inhabitants as they went about their activities. After his first visit, for example, he reported that he had been able to observe perhaps 500 of the 800 residents said to be at Jonestown at

that time. In addition, he had private interviews with a number of persons who had been subjects of welfare and whereabouts inquiries from relatives and friends (Georgetown 2087).

In the course of this visit the Consul adopted the following procedure for conducting individual interviews which he continued to employ in later visits. He would request to see the individual and also to examine the individual's passport in order to confirm his identity. The interview was conducted in an open space at some distance from any structure and out of earshot in order to assure absolute privacy. The Consul would ask the individual about the specific concern or allegation which had been brought to the attention of the Embassy (e.g., that individuals were being held in Jonestown against their will, being forced to work long hours, had insufficient food, or were subject to physical abuse); he would also offer to escort the person from Jonestown then and there accompanied by a Guyanese police official from the station at Matthews Ridge who invariably accompanied him on these visits to provide transportation and act as escort. The Consul further offered to see that the individual was repatriated

to the United States.

At least fifty interviews were conducted in this manner during the visits made by Consular Officers in Jonestown over the past 16 months. In no case did the individual interviewed support the allegations of mistreatment that had been made by their relatives or friends, and in no case did the anyone take advantage of the offer made by the Consul to escort them from the settlement and repatriate them to the United States. These Officers reported that those interviewed did not appear to be under physical or emotional pressure, nor did it appear that their anwers were other than spontaneous.

Embassy officers visiting Jonestown noted in their reports that some of the inhabitants performed hard physical labor of the sort usual on a large farm, but that they seemed to be well fed and cared for, including reasonable medical attention, and that they expressed satisfaction with their lives. Similar impressions were conveyed to the Embassy by others who visited the complex including Guyanese police officials..

Mrs. Deborah Blakey claims in her affidavit of June 15, 1978, that the Consul's visits were known in advance including the names of the people he wished to interview, and that these people were carefully rehearsed in their responses by the Reverend Jones and others. The Embassy had no way of knowing whether rehearsals took place in advance of visits by Embassy officers, but as noted above their answers appeared to be natural and spontaneous. Because of the remoteness of Jonestown and the need to arrange transportation in advance, the Peoples Temple Office in Georgetown was necessarily informed of forthcoming visits. In addition, the Consul had no authority which would have permitted him to enter the commune without the knowledge and agreement of its inhabitants. The Consul did provide in advance the names of some persons he wished to see on routine consular matters in order to insure that they would not be absent during his visit. However he did not provide in advance the names of any he wished to interview because of charges of alleged mistreatment made by relatives. These people he asked to see only after arrival at Jonestown.

The subject of possible brainwashing of Peoples Temple members came up during Congressman Ryan's initial briefing in the Department on September 15. It was explained that Consular Officers cannot make definitive judgements on whether a person has been subjected to brainwashing or other forms of mind control. It was suggested that Congressman Ryan include a trained clinical psychiatrist in his party.

Among the allegations made by concerned relatives of Jonestown residents were charges of severe beatings, unusual punishments such as shaving the head, and physical restraints such as fences surrounding the camp, all of which should have been subject to visual verification by

visitors. Despite careful aerial and ground observation and interviews with alleged victims, Consular Officers were never able to confirm these charges.

6. QUESTION: What information does the Department of State have with respect to the relationship between the Government of Guyana, its officials, and the Peoples Temple Church settlement in Jonestown and its facility in Georgetown?

ANSWER: The Government of Guyana had encouraged the establishment of the Peoples Temple agricultural cooperative in 1973 because the philosophy of the group, a form of cooperative socialism, was consistent with the philosophy of the Government of Guyana; and the agricultural plans of the Peoples Temple also appeared consistent with the development goals of the Government. Consequently, the Government of Guyana leased a large area, reported to be 27,000 acres, in Northwest Guyana to the Peoples Temple.

The Government of Guyana continued to give its blessing to the Peoples Temple agricultural community up to the date of Congressman Ryan's visit. Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Development Ptolemy Reid was widely regarded as the principal

the Peoples Temple from acts it regarded as deliberate harassment. For example, when a team of investigative reporters visited Guyana to do a story on the Peoples Temple they told the Embassy that they were pressured by the Guyanese immigration service to limit their stay to one day. (Georgetown 2028)

While the Peoples Temple apparently continued to have the approval of the Guyanese Government at high levels, some working level officials in the police, customs, and immigration services expressed concern to the Embassy about a large community of Americans living in their country beyond the range of their effective jurisdiction and control. For example, the police expressed concern that the trawler owned by the Peoples Temple, which frequently travelled to Trinidad or elsewhere, might be bringing in guns, drugs, or currency illegally. The trawler was subsequently required to stop at the police post at Mabaruma on its homeward journeys to be searched. As far as the Embassy is aware, however, no contraband was ever discovered (IBID).

7. QUESTION: Was the Department of State and/or the American Embassy aware of the presence in Jonestown of extensive quantities of firearms and ammunition? If so, was this information given to the Ryan Delegation? Did the presence of the firearms and ammunition conform to relevant Guyanese laws? If not, what action, if any, did the Government of Guyana take with respect to the presence of the weapons?

ANSWER: Neither the Embassy in Georgetown nor the Department were aware of the presence of large quantities of firearms and ammunition in Jonestown. As was stated earlier, the community was known to have a certain number of firearms, which were used for hunting game in the region, a not uncommon practice in that part of Guyana. According to the Government of Guyana a total of four separate licenses had been issued to members of the community (Georgetown 3125 OP. CIT.) It is evident that there may have been as many as thirty or more weapons which were unlicensed.

Department files contain an interim report dated August 26, 1977, of an investigation carried out by the U.S. Customs Service in California between February and August, 1977, of the possible illegal

export of up to 170 guns from California to Jonestown in Guyana. The report also mentions other charges lying outside the jurisdiction of the Customs Service such as various forms of physical and mental abuse of Peoples Temple members. The Department apparently received no further reports of this investigation, and we have no knowledge of any charges or indictments arising from it. Officers involved in briefing Congressman Ryan before his departure were unaware at the time of the existence of this report.

8. QUESTION: Were the activities of the Peoples Temple Church investigated by the FBI and/or other U.S. Government agencies and, if so, were their findings made available to the Department of State?

ANSWER: The FBI has informed the Department that it had conducted no investigations of the Peoples Temple prior to the death of Congressman Ryan. As reported in the press, Congressman Ryan apparently requested that the Justice Department conduct an investigation of the Peoples Temple at one time.

The Department is unaware of any other investigations which may have been conducted by agencies of the federal government, or of state or local governments,

of the Peoples Temple or its activities other than the single report of the Customs investigation noted above.

9. QUESTION: What efforts were undertaken by the U.S. Embassy in Guyana to insure that American lives and property of the Jonesotwn inhabitants were adequately safeguarded?

As indicated abouve, a number of visits were made to Jonestown over the past 16 months during which Consular Officers investigated every specific charge of abuse or mistreatment made by relatives of residents of Jonestown. The Consular Officer offered to escort the individual from Jonestown and see that he was repatriated. In no case were the allegations substantiated or the offer of escort and repatriation accepted. The Embassy also investigated the charge that Peoples Temple was bilking members of their social security benefits. They were able to establish that social security benificiaries received and personally endorsed their checks, though there was no certainty about what they may have done with the proceeds.

As the Committee is aware, American citizens residing abroad are subject to the laws and regulations of the country in which they reside. The State Department and the U.S. Embaassy have no jurisdiction over them and no

legal right to interfere if these Americans choose to avoid contact with U.S. authorities. Under the Privacy Act and basic constitutional guarantees there is clearly no authority for any agency of the U.S. Government to launch an investigation of the activities of U.S. citizens in the absence of evidence or the commission of a crime. Neither would it be appropriate for the Department of State to press a foreign government to investigate activities of Americans within their jursdiction in the absence of strong evidence of a crime, or that the welfare of these Americans was at risk.

10. Question: Was the U.S. Embassy in Guyana aware of any reports of physical violence being directed against members of the Peoples Temple Church and, if so, was this information made available to the Department of State in Washington?

The Embassy had received over a period of time a large amount of correspondence from private citizens in the U.S. which was strongly supportive of, and on other occasions highly critical of, the Peoples Temple. It was also aware of articles which had appeared in the U.S. press both favorable to and critical of the Peoples Temple. The Embassy did

not have the ability or authority to conduct any sort of investigation of the Peoples Temple nor would it have been appropriate or even legal for the Embassy to attempt such an investigation in view of legal restrictions and the constitutional safeguards available to American citizens. All of the information on the Peoples Temple available to the Embassy was of course available to the Department of State.

Although the Embassy neither launched a formal investigation itself nor requested the Government of Guyana to do so for reasons stated above, it did consult informally with Guyanese officials on specific charges or allegations made by former members of the Peoples Temple and friends and relatives of Jonestown residents such as the affidavit executed by 57 concerned relatives and forwarded to the Secretary under cover of a letter from Mr. Tim Stoen of San Francisco in May of 1978. The affidavit executed in June 1978 by Mrs. Deborah Blakey making a number of serious charges against the Reverend Jim Jones and the Peoples Temple, and in which the first report of mass suicide rehearsals at Jonestown was mentioned, was also received by the Department, the Embassy, and the Government of Guyana. However it was not discussed with Guyanese Officials.

As indicated above in the answer to question No. 5, Consular Officers of the Embassy repeatedly made serious and dedicated efforts to confirm or refute the various allegations which had been made in print and in letters and documents received from relatives of Jonestown residents. In so doing they conducted some 75 interviews of Jonestown residents, some 50 of them cases in which specific requests from friends and relatives had been received, in conditions of complete privacy. In addition they conducted extensive personal observation of the Jonestown communtiy, and compared notes with officials of local law enforcement agencies who visited Jonestown from time to time. They were never able to confirm or refute the many reports and complaints which had been received.

11. QUESTION: Was the Government of Guyana ever requested to investigate the activities of the Peoples Temple Church? If not, why not?

Answer: Neither the Department or the Embassy ever officially requested the Government of Guyana to investigate the activities of the Peoples Temple. Such a request would have been inappropriate in the absence of

strong evidence that a crime had been committed, or that the welfare of American citizens was seriously threatened. As indicated above, the Embassy Officers informally discussed many of these reports with Guyanese Officials in the Police, Customs, and Immigration Departments. They too were aware of these reports but had been unable to confirm them despite efforts to do so. In the Stoen child custody case the Embassy did send the Government a diplomatic note seeking assurances of due process for both parties in the case and urging expeditious handling of the case (Note at Tab).

As indicated above, on June 1978, the Embassy in a cable to the Department emphasized that there was no effective Guyanese presence or control at Jonestown; asked that the Department review the situation to determine the legal authority and responsibility of the United States Government with respect to a community of Americans living voluntarily abroad; and, if appropriate, request that it (the Embassy) be instructed to press the Government of Guyana to assume effective jurisdiction at Jonestown. (Georgetown 6946)

The Department replied that jurisdiction plainly belonged to the Government of Guyana but that it assumed both the Government and the Peoples Temple were aware of this. It advised that an approach to the Government of Guyana in the absence of a request from an American citizen member of the community or his family to do so, or of evidence of lawlessness within the community could be construed by some as U.S. Government interference (Department 161993).

12. QUESTION: Did representatives of any U.S. Government agency interview individuals who had "defected" from the Peoples Temple Church in Guyana? If so, was this information made known to Congressman Ryan?

ANSWER: The head of the Consular Section of the Embassy in Georgetown during most of this period interviewed Leon Broussard in August, 1977, and Mrs. Deborah Blakey in May, 1978. Broussard was encountered in the course of his visit to Jonestown in August, 1977 at the nearby town of Matthews Ridge. Broussard made no charges against the Reverend Jones or the Peoples Temple, but said that the life was not for him and he wished the Peoples Temple to return him to California. The Consul brought this request to the attention of the Reverend Jones

Mrs. Blakey, along with Tim Stoen and other relatives and former members of the Peoples Temple accompanied Congressman Ryan during his final briefing in the Department on November 13 (Memcon at Tab _____).

Reports of interviews of former Peoples Temple members which may have been conducted by other agencies of the U.S. Government were never sent to the Department with the exception of the single customs investigation cited above (Tab).

13. QUESTION: Was any consideration given to restricting the passports of potential inhabitants of Jonestown who applied for a passport for the purpose of going to Guyana pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 211a as amended.

ANSWER: Passports of persons travelling to Guyana for the purpose of taking up residence in Jonestown could not have been restricted under current laws and regulations. (The pertinent regulations are stated in Title 22 CFR 51.70 and 51.71. at Tab).

There are no restrictions on the use of U.S. passports for travel to any geographic area at present. Passports may be denied only in specific cases where the applicant is subject to court orders, requests for

extradition, non-payment of government loans and the like, as enumerated in the mentioned sections of the Code of Federal Regulations attached. We are not aware that any members of the Peoples Temple were subject to the provisions for denial of or revocation of a passport.

Drafted: ARA/CAR:ACHewitt
1/11/78 22621

19